UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/603,184	06/26/2000	Hirohisa Suzuki	81784.0211	3365

26021 7590 10/24/2006

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.
1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 1400
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER	
DESIR, PIERRE LOUIS	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/603,184	SUZUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pierre-Louis Desir	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 11-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 11-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/08/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Tsuji does not show an LPF that blocks a sub-signal and a pilot signal in a high frequency band of the input audio signal and passes only a main signal of the input audio signal.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As cited in the previous Office Action, Tsuji discloses a circuit wherein only the low frequency component is extracted; sub-signals and pilot signals are eliminated - column 20, lines 35-57; column 10, lines 48-55). See Figures 57, 64, 65, 70; column 20, line 35 to column 22, line 57.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsuji et al. (US Patent Number 6,690,805).

Regarding claim 1, Tsuji et al. discloses a noise cancel circuit (Figure 64) for removing noise components in an input audio signal, comprising: an LPF (13) for blocking a sub-signal

and a pilot signal in a high frequency band of the input audio signal and passing only a main signal of the input audio signal (only the low frequency component is extracted; sub-signals and pilot signals are eliminated) (see Figures 57, 64, 65, 70, column 10, lines 48-55, and column 20, line 35 to column 22, line 57); an interpolation circuit (14) for interpolation processing on the main signal output from the LPF ("AUDIO SIGNAL" from 19); a noise detection circuit (20) for detecting the noise portion of said input audio signal (see column 21, lines 57-61), and a selection circuit replacing (i.e., exchanged) (see column 21, lines 57-61) the noise portion of said input audio signal with an output signal from said interpolation circuit according to an output signal from said noise detection circuit (See Figures 57, 64, 65, 70, column 21, lines 57-61).

Regarding claim 3, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses the noise portion of said input audio signal is interpolated (exchanged) by said interpolation circuit according to an output signal from said noise detection circuit (column 21, lines 57-61). See Figures 57, 64, 65, 70; column 20, line 35 to column 22, line 57.

Regarding claim 4, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 3). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses a first delay circuit (either 15 alone or 15 in combination with 12) for delaying said input audio signal; a selection circuit (24) for selecting either the output signal from said interpolation circuit or the delayed input audio signal from said first delay circuit, wherein said selection circuit is controlled according to the output signal from said noise detection circuit (column 21, lines 57-61). See Figures 57, 64, 65, 70; column 20, line 35 to column 22, line 57.

Regarding claim 5, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 4). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses wherein said interpolation circuit performs interpolation processing and outputs an interpolation signal regardless of presence or absence of noise components. See Figures 57, 64, 65, 70; column 20, line 35 to column 22, line 57.

Regarding claim 6, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses a second delay circuit (12) for delaying said interpolation signal from said interpolation circuit. See Figures 57, 64, 65, 70, column 20, line 35 to column 22, line 57.

Regarding claim 7, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 6). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses wherein said second delay circuit (12) is disposed in a processing stage prior to said interpolation circuit (14) (see Figures 64 or 57).

Regarding claim 8, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 6). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses wherein a delay time of said first delay circuit is determined based on a sum of an interpolation processing time of said interpolation circuit and a delay time of said second delay circuit (the signal is delayed by the delay circuit 15 by an amount to coincide in timing with an output of the interpolation circuit 14 - column 21, lines 49-51. Therefore, because the first delay circuit is the combination of delay 12 and delay 15, the delay time of the first delay circuit is the sum of the interpolation processing time and the delay time of the second delay circuit.)

Regarding claim 9, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 8). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses wherein the delay time of said second delay circuit corresponds to a difference obtained by subtracting the interpolation processing time of said

interpolation circuit from a time delay between generation and detection of said pulse noise. (Generation and detection of the pulse noise occurs at 20 between "AUDIO SIGNAL" and 24- see e.g. Figure 64. This includes the delay time of the second delay circuit 12 and the interpolation processing time of the interpolation circuit. Therefore, the difference obtained by subtracting the interpolation processing time of the interpolation circuit from the time delay between generation and detection of the pulse noise corresponds to the delay time of the second delay circuit.)

Regarding claim 11, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses wherein said input audio signal is an FM radio signal (Figure 57, input is FM radio signal; for example, in a car radio - column 1, line 10) (column 20, lines 35-57; column 10, lines 48-55).

Regarding claim 13, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Tsuji et al. further discloses a switch (24) for changing (exchanged) the noise portion of said input audio signal to the output signal from said interpolation circuit according to the output signal from said noise detection circuit (column 21, lines 57-61). See Figures 57, 64, 65, 70; column 20, line 35 to column 22, line 57.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuji et al. (US Patent Number 6,690,805).

Regarding claim 2, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Tsuji et al. discloses wherein said interpolation circuit executes polynomial interpolation. However, fails to specify spline interpolation as claimed.

Spline interpolation by definition uses low-degree polynomials in each of the interpolation intervals. Consequently, spline interpolation is a form of polynomial interpolation. Spline interpolation is preferred over polynomial interpolation because the interpolation error can be made small even when using low degree polynomials for the spline. Thus spline interpolation avoids the problem of Runge's phenomenon, which occurs when using high degree polynomials. The spline interpolant is easier to evaluate than the high-degree polynomials used in polynomial interpolation. In terms of computer calculation time, spline interpolation is faster; therefore, less expensive.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use spline interpolation instead of polynomial interpolation because: the interpolation error can be made small even when using low degree polynomials for the spline, avoids the problem of Runge's phenomenon which occurs when using high degree polynomials, is easier to evaluate than the high-degree polynomials used in polynomial interpolation, and is faster in terms of computer calculation time, therefore, less expensive.

Regarding claim 12, Tsuji et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). However, fails to specify the claimed timer as part of the same embodiment explained above.

In alternative embodiment, Tsuji et al. discloses a timer (32a - Figure 21 or 35a - Figure 25) for controlling a timing of changing the noise portion of said input audio signal to the output signal from said interpolation circuit (column 16, lines 39-57 and column 17, lines 22-45). Tsuji et al. teaches that the embodiments overlap, therefore, are interchangeable (column 20, lines 52-57; column 23, lines 9-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Tsuji et al.'s embodiment explained above with timer for controlling a timing of changing the noise portion of said input audio signal to the output signal from said interpolation circuit because it is the same Tsuji et al. who teaches that the different embodiments overlap, therefore, are interchangeable.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre-Louis Desir whose telephone number is (571) 272-7799. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00AM- 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pierre-Louis Desir
10/18/2006

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER